

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,856	LAUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Ungar	1642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Ungar.

(3) Peter Dehlinger.

(2) Susan Fitch.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the action mailed 12/13/07 withdrawing all claims from examination. Upon review of the prosecution history, it has become apparent that the originally examined claims are drawn to a polypeptide comprising an epitope of SEQ ID NO:2, as broadly interpreted by the office. The current claims, on the other hand, are drawn to a polypeptide comprising 90% identity to SEQ ID NO:2 that induces an immune response to human PAP. In point of fact, the newly amended claims and the originally presented claims are both drawn to polypeptides comprising amino acid residues of SEQ ID NO:2, thus, it would appear that the newly amended claims in fact narrow the originally examined claims which is a proper amendment of the claims. Applicant will submit a response to the previous office action traversing the action and requesting that it be vacated. It would appear to Examiner that upon receipt of the response, the previous action would be properly vacated and prosecution should continue apace.